DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 169 124 TM 008 621

AUTHOR Reed, Vincent E.
TITLE The Evaluation System: Description, History, and Status Report.
INSTITUTION District of Columbia Public Schools, Washington, D.C. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.
PUB DATE Dec 78
NOTE 35p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Board of Education Policy; Curriculum Evaluation; *Data Bases; Data Collection; *Educational Assessment; Elementary Education; *Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; Field Studies; Information Dissemination; Pilot Projects; Reading Programs; Student Characteristics; *Student Evaluation; Test Results
IDENTIFIERS District of Columbia Public Schools

ABSTRACT

The philosophy of the District of Columbia Public School System is that evaluation should help to determine what was intended, what was done, and what was the result. It should contribute to improvement and should involve students, staff, and parents. Two essential components of the District's evaluation system are the data bank and field studies. The data bank includes files on fall pretest results; the reading curriculum; classroom and student characteristics; and spring post testing. The field studies provide data which can be used to identify programs of interest, compare groups, or locate students for followup study--data about attitudes, teaching methods, parent participation, etc. The development of the evaluation system began in 1969; by 1975, 44 elementary schools were involved in the data collection. The schools were provided with feedback in the following areas: characteristics of students in reading programs, comparison of schools within a region; teacher turnover; student attendance; and characteristics of entire classes. Additional data analyses are planned for the future. (GDC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED169124

PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE EVALUATION SYSTEM

DESCRIPTION, HISTORY, AND STATUS REPORT

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Cooper

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

VINCENT E. REED

SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

DECEMBER 1978

TM008 621

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
PART I	Evaluation Philosophy	1
PART II	Evaluation System - Essential Features	3
PART III	The History of the Evaluation System-Pilot Phase (1970-71)	16
PART IV	The Reestablishment of the Evaluation System-School Year 1974-75	21
PART V	The Evaluation System-School Years 1975-76 to the Present	29

PART I

I Evaluation Philosophy

The philosophy held by the District of Columbia Public School System is that evaluation should help to determine what was intended, what was done, what was the result. It should also contribute to the consideration of what might be done differently in order to accomplish the goals of the educational system.

Evaluation is everybody's business. Students should be involved in evaluating their progress. Teachers, specialists, administrators, parents--all should be involved in evaluation. Elements of evaluation are needs, goals, and activities that are intended to achieve goals in relation to needs. There are obviously different kinds of evaluative questions that apply at any level of the educational system; for example:

1. What are the needs?
2. What are the objectives and goals?
3. What is done to accomplish goals?
4. Were goals accomplished?

Answers to these questions describe what happened. Another kind of evaluative question is concerned with diagnosis. For example, if goals were not accomplished, why weren't they and what might be done about it? These questions deal with explanations and alternatives.

Consider examples from the classroom and from the system. A teacher finds that Johnny has trouble telling the difference between the letter p and the letter d. She develops some special exercises

for Johnny to help him learn. She later investigates to see if he did learn to tell them apart. If he did learn, she goes on from there to another goal. If he didn't, she must make a further diagnosis and try another exercise. At each step she will need certain information pertaining to needs, activities and goals.

At the system level, it is found that many students are not achieving as expected. Programs are developed and tried. A later investigation is made to see if achievement has been improved. If not, programs need to be modified and further programs carried out.

At both levels, goals are needed as check points. For the teacher, a momentary goal or objective may be the students' ability to discriminate letters. For the system, some goals are, or should be, embodied in the tests used to measure progress.

The functions of evaluation at the system level, as the school administration conceives them, are to describe needs, programs and goal accomplishment; and to provide information to teachers, administrators and others that will help in the process of improving goal accomplishment.

PART II

II Evaluation System - Essential Features

The Evaluation System that the Division of Research and Evaluation is currently implementing has two essential components:

1. A data bank
2. Selected field studies.

A. The Data Bank

The concentration has been on the data bank. The key element of the data bank is an identification numbering system that will allow information from different sources to be cross-tabulated or combined, and that will enable trends to be analyzed from year to year. Since the data bank is the basic tool for evaluation at the school system level, it is worth describing what it is and how it may be used.

The data bank, as a tool in performing evaluation functions, is intended to enable the Division to determine the progress of students in the system in relation to goals; to identify promising activities; to provide feedback to teachers, principals, parents and others about progress and activities; and to provide some indications of factors that appear to enhance effectiveness.

There are innumerable factors that influence achievement of goals. Indeed, to describe all the characteristics of

a program carried out by a single teacher with a single student would require infinitely more information than could ever be collected and used in a data bank. So, the data bank can contain only a few items of information characterizing students, programs and outcomes. It thus serves only as a tool for monitoring overall progress and for examining a few relationships that may be related to progress. To serve a useful feedback function, it should provide descriptive and explanatory information that is impractical for a teacher, administrator or parent to obtain on his own in one school. Thus, it should serve to provide information about patterns.

(1) What the data bank presently contains.

The data bank is at this stage a set of files, some in the form of computer tapes. The files are being prepared so that information in one can be correlated with information in another.

The following are the files in existence at this time:

a. Fall Test Results File

This file contains the test results for each student who was tested in the fall in the city-wide testing. The test results for each student are on an objective by objective basis, as well as on a composite score basis.

b. Reading Program File

In the spring teachers of students in grades 1-6 complete for each student in their class a form called the Reading Program Form. On the form the teacher indicates the materials each student is working with in reading. Since a variety of materials are often used as part of a student's instructional program, the teacher is asked to indicate which materials the student is working with most frequently, next most frequently, and, if appropriate, third most frequently. In each case the teacher is also asked to show the approximate reading level of the materials. Since teachers may vary the reading program for a particular student, they are instructed to indicate the materials, levels, and emphasis (frequency) for the preceding month and tell how typical these are of the program for the whole year. Teachers are also asked to indicate whether the student needs extra help in reading; whether he/she is receiving additional reading instruction during the regular school day (and if so, from what source and how often); approximately how often the student reads on his/her own in school; and the extent to which he/she appears to enjoy reading. Teachers are also asked why they are using the particular materials.

This information is processed, and descriptive profiles of each student prepared by computer. These profiles are returned to principals and teachers, at the beginning of the new school year.

Since the information is on a student by student basis it is possible to correlate it with fall test data, with spring test data, and with classroom and student background data.

It is important to understand exactly what the Reading Program File is and what it is not. It does identify the teacher's reading instruction program for each student when the program is defined as:

1. The approach (e.g., basal, linguistics, programmed, language experience, etc.), the materials within approach, and the reading grade level of materials
2. The number of approach-materials-levels up to three different ones as applicable
3. The general frequency of emphasis of each approach-materials-level in relation to each other over a particular limited period of time.

It also identifies the source of additional reading instruction other than the teacher (e.g., reading specialist from the reading center; urban service

corps tutor; parent tutor; secondary school tutor, etc.), for the same period of time, to the best of the teacher's knowledge.

The reading program file thus has categorizing information about reading programs as defined. It tells primarily what each student was using as part of his formal reading instruction over a particular period of time. It does not tell what the teacher's specific reading objectives are for the student. It does not tell what the teacher's method or style of teaching is; it does not tell what sequence of units or instruction is employed; it does not tell what the teacher's attitudes or competencies are. It does not tell what the tutor does or uses in working with the student.

What good is it, then? In and of itself, the reading program information answers four basic questions:

1. Specifically, what are the approaches and materials (and levels of materials) that were used with each student during the school year?
2. How diversified are reading programs (as defined) among students in a particular classroom?
3. How diversified are these among students in a particular grade?
4. What is the continuity or discontinuity in reading programs from year to year, or from school to school?

In combination with fall and spring test information, the reading program information answers questions such as:

1. How did each student do, and what program did he have? (information to be given to this year's and next year's teacher).

2. Is there any evidence that students with similar needs tended to achieve more with one combination of programs and additional instruction than another?

3. Is there any evidence that students with similar needs tended to do better in classrooms with many different programs than in classrooms with few different programs?

In no case will individual teachers or students be identified in such analyses as 2 or 3. These will be statistical reports only.

There are other elements of information that can help in examining relationships of students, programs and progress. These are being gathered separately and will form the content of two other files, to be described below.

It is not intended to imply that the test results and reading program information will explain differences in progress in detail. It is intended to provide some pattern information about needs, activities and results on one level. It is hoped that the pattern information will serve to suggest and stimulate consideration of further program needs, and to highlight promising approaches in relation to

individual students.

As a final comment on the reading program files, it should be noted that the file (and the form) is viewed as preliminary. A general approach to evaluation, as described earlier, calls for relating objectives (based on needs) to course content to measures of objectives. The reading program form is a first start at a practical means of categorizing course content. Pretests are one means of identifying needs (and thus objectives). Posttests should provide measures of accomplishment of course objectives. The present data bank has test data and program data utilizing instruments currently in use. As the system changes or clarifies its objectives, the content of the test files will change accordingly. As reading programs are discussed and analyzed, the content of that file will undoubtedly change. The primary purpose of the data bank is to keep as good a record as possible and feasible of current practice. It will obviously, therefore, change in content as practices and needs change.

c. Classroom and Student Background File

Data gathered pertain to students and their classrooms. All the data is collected manually from already existing sources. It is not the intention of the System to keep

collecting such information manually in subsequent years. Since it is information that exists (though usually scattered and non-uniform), it is the aim of the Evaluation System to help develop procedures that will make the information available routinely in the future. The following are the kinds of data being gathered:

1. When a student entered a particular class, especially if other than the first day of school
2. Grade level designation
3. When a student transferred from or left the class
4. Total time in attendance during the period of enrollment in the class
5. Number and types of referrals for each class
6. Number of ESL students, and student eligible for free lunch and reduced cost lunch
7. The type of transfer or withdrawal by the students
8. The number of changes of teacher assignments for the class
9. Whether the class had one or more aides
10. The approximate amount of time provided by the aide
11. Amount of time teacher was absent from class (the purpose of this is not to rate teachers, but to provide a measure of continuity of regular instructional program as represented by the teacher; as with all data from students and teachers alike, treatment and reporting of it will be statistical only, but by individual)

12. Type of teaching situation (e.g., self-contained, team teaching, open space, etc.).

The purpose of this information is to enable evaluative analyses to take into account variations in certain classroom characteristics and student characteristics that pertain to children and their educational program, and to be able to determine the variations in extent to which children were exposed to programs as represented by his enrollment in a class. It is worth repeating here that one important evaluative result is purely descriptive. The information being collected will help provide descriptive measures of certain classroom characteristics, including student turnover, teacher turnover, staffing patterns, class sizes, class attendance rates, etc. For the system, these will help establish baseline measures and bases for measuring change. They will also help in further planning by suggesting certain areas of need as determined by particular target groups of students.

As stated above, all the information being collected presently exists in some form in the schools. Classroom assignments and changes in them for students, attendance, transfers and referrals (with time of each) are the essential elements. The Division is working on means of making this information available

for evaluation system use routinely without burden on teachers and without need for mutual data collection.

d. Spring Test File

The test file for spring testing has posttest data on a student by student basis. This test file will also have student identification numbers, teacher, school and grade, so that information can be correlated with variables or information from any of the other files for purposes of evaluation research.

The data bank contains information only on students who are in the Evaluation System schools, grades 1-6. If a student leaves during the year for another school or enters during the year from another school, he can not be included in some of the analyses. The Division does not plan as yet to follow students who transfer to other schools in making some evaluations. Nor, of course, can it include students who were not tested in the fall or in the spring.

Should the school system move to selected specific behavioral objectives for each student or group of students, an Objectives File can be created so that objectives can be matched with mastery for each student. The key always is the student ID number which the school system must move to including routinely on all pertinent records or forms.

It should finally be noted that by means of the ID number it will be possible over a period of years to do longitudinal studies of the progress of specific groups of students that will be far more useful in determining trends and the effectiveness of particular programs and projects than is possible in a single year.

(2) To be included in the data bank.

It is the plan to add the following file to the data bank:

Special Programs and Projects File

The final information needed to be gathered is a record of the special programs or projects being provided for students and teachers during the regular school day. A catalog and code structure of programs and projects are essential.

The information to be collected will enable an examination to be made of the following questions:

1. What are the special programs and projects in the participating schools?
2. To what target groups are they addressed?
3. What is the source and funding of each?
4. When did they start and when are they expected to end?
5. What students are involved? (if a project or program can be identified with specific students, this is noted; otherwise, only the classrooms or grades affected are recorded).

6. What teachers, parents and others are participants?

7. How much total time was spent by students in the project?

The purpose of the information outlined above is to describe the distributions and characteristics of projects, and to permit analyses of achievement to be made by students involved in or affected by various projects.

Where participants are specifically or individually enrolled in projects, the linkage with achievement can be made by ID numbers. Where whole grades or classes are involved, the linkage can be made through grade or class numbers. Although the effects of a project can not be isolated directly if whole grades or classes are involved, one way of evaluating effects is to compare academic progress of categories of students in the project (e.g., students who were below certain levels in one or more areas in the fall, or below the 25 percentile for the population, etc.) with similar groups of students who were not in the project. Another way is follow up in subsequent years of samples of students in the project to determine to what extent the project appears to have influenced them. A third means is to follow up with pre and post assessment of students of similar educational achievement characteristics who are in the same schools. It can not substitute for

controlled experiments; but few projects are ever designed and implemented as controlled experiments.

B. Selected Field Studies

The second major component of the evaluation system as it currently is planned is field study and observation. Field studies of the kind needed are not being done this year in an effort to concentrate on the higher priorities assigned to the Division.

The kinds of field studies contemplated are those that seek to describe and measure variables that can not be easily, fairly or practically reported routinely (such as test scores). Such studies would include studies of attitudes, teaching styles, ways of organizing and using learning environments, methods of implementing and sequencing particular approaches or reading programs, ways in which parents and others participate in and contribute to the instructional program, and so on.

The data bank can be used in conjunction with field studies to help identify classes or programs of interest, to provide information about comparison groups, or to help locate students for follow-up study.

PART III

III History of the Evaluation System-Pilot Phase (1970-71)*

The responsibility for the evaluation of the educational program of the Public Schools of the District of Columbia lies with the Division of Research and Evaluation. In June 1969 the Division embarked upon the development of a system to accomplish this task. A year of planning with teachers, principals, students and central office administrators resulted in a strategy which was accepted and supported. It became known as the "Evaluation System." A brief summary of the steps taken in the implementation of the "System" follows:

As the initial step, all plans for the implementation of the Evaluation System were cleared with the Superintendent, the Deputy Superintendent, appropriate Assistant Superintendents, and the Teachers' Union. With their approval, the Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation began implementation.

Early in the summer of 1970 one elementary school was selected as a pilot school to try out the precedures as planned. As a result of this experience certain modifications were made and during August and September the modified plan was carried out in the other 15 elementary schools in the Phase I group. Briefly, these steps were taken:

- Meetings were held by the Acting Division Head with the principals of the participating schools during August

* Titles of operating units and positions as stated may have been changed in subsequent years.

and September to explain the evaluation system.

- Emphasis was given to the establishment of a School/Community Evaluation Committee for each school. The membership of the committee designated to include community members and parents, school staff, a teacher/Union representative and students.
- Each school was requested to designate a community representative to serve as chairman of the School/Community Evaluation Committee.
- Community chairmen were designated by the participating schools and meetings were held with these chairmen during September by the Acting Division Head, staff and consultants at neighborhood libraries to explain the evaluation system and the role of the School/Community Evaluation Committee.
- The School/Community Evaluation Committee membership was developed in the school communities by the Community chairman and the school principal.
- Meetings were held during October with the School/Community Evaluation Committees with the community chairman presiding and school staff and consultants serving as resource people.

In addition to the above work in the schools the Division worked during July, August and September 1970 with the Department of Automated Information Systems in developing the design and procedures for the data input and processing relative to the Evaluation System. During July, the Division worked with the Division of Administrative Services to develop a form to provide the information needed for

evaluation purposes in order to avoid, where possible adding to the workload of school clerks and teachers.

Personnel of the Department of Pupil Personnel Services, and the Division worked out a plan for the provision of test data for program evaluation purposes. All of the above coordination took place in an endeavor to utilize fully information and resources already available, and to avoid duplication of work both in the schools and in the central administration.

The criteria used for the selection of elementary schools to be included in Phase I of the Evaluation System were:

1. Two from each of the eight wards of the city
2. Feeder school, if possible, to a junior high school for which data already existed in DAIS
3. One relatively large school for that ward and one relatively small school for that ward, based on membership.

The sixteen schools selected are:

Bancroft	Bunker Hill	Lafayette	Noyes
Beers	Cleveland	McGogney	Petworth
Blow	Davis	Meyer	Stoddert
Bruce	Hendley	Miner	Walker-Jones

The staff members of the Division held conferences with the principals, reading specialists, and teachers during September and October of school year 70-71 for orientation purposes. The Reading Program Form was reviewed, purpose for the data collection was

explained and schedules for distribution of the forms were established. Reading Program Forms for each student grades 1-6 were compiled into class packs for each teacher. The forms were delivered to the principals for distribution.

Distribution of forms by Division staff began during the first week of September and was completed by the last week of September. The principals set up the delivery time according to their schedules. Explanation of instructions in filling out the forms were again required for some teachers and reading specialists. Nearly all forms were returned to this Division by the end of November. After being checked for accuracy and coded, they were forwarded to the Department of Automated Information Systems to be keypunched and tabulated. Results of the data were compiled. Printouts were made for the schools and teachers, and were delivered to the schools by staff members of the Division in April 1971.

Additional classroom/student background and school special program/project data were needed for the Data Bank; therefore a staff member of the Division conferred with principals, secured approval from them and schedules were established. The collection of this data required two teams, consisting of two staff members per team, going to the schools. The data collection procedure proved to be both time consuming and somewhat cumbersome. This was partially due to the fact that needed data, such as student attendance, transfers, referrals, types of programs and names of students' instructors,

had to be gathered from several different sources. It was anticipated that this phase would be completed by the end of April and that additional student data would be obtained during the month of May and after the close of school.

Staff members worked in the schools during the summer of 1971, collecting data. Unfortunately, the Evaluation System was affected by the systemwide budget reduction during the following months and this phase could not be completed without the required resources.

PART IV

IV The Reestablishment of the Evaluation System-School Year 1974-75

The reestablishment of the Evaluation System during school year 1974-75 became one of the priorities expressed by the Superintendent of Schools and the Board of Education.

During the months preceding the opening of schools, and including the month of September 1974, the following steps were taken:

- Meetings were held by the Assistant Superintendent for Research and Evaluation and staff members with consultants, the Division of Automated Information Services, and other central office personnel.
- Emphasis was given to systematically reviewing the system for the purpose of modifying goals, objectives, and procedures, where appropriate.
- Approaches and procedures, including all facets of the Evaluation System to be carried out during FY 1975, were finalized.
- Data collection instruments were reviewed and modified with the aid of principals and other school personnel.
- Procedures and timetables for meetings, collection of data, processing of data, analysis of data, and feedback were established.
- Responsibilities and assignments were given to available Division of Research and Evaluation staff personnel for implementing the system.

A meeting with Regional Superintendents was held in October at which time a detailed overview of the Evaluation System was presented. Suggestions for promoting and improving the system were entertained. The approval of schools to be included for school year

1974-75 was given. Although the Division of Research and Evaluation had planned a gradual phasing in of the number of schools in the Evaluation System for FY 1975, the requests by Regional staff for inclusion of additional schools resulted in forty-four elementary schools being selected. These schools included the original sixteen schools in the pilot phase, all RENP schools, all open-space schools, and additional schools (i.e., Tri-School and Six-School Complex) suggested by Regional officers.

The forty-four schools approved were: (the original sixteen schools are indicated by an asterisk.)

Region I

*Beers
Birney (RENP, Title I)
Congress Heights (RENP)
Draper (RENP, Title I)
Friendship (RENP, Title I)
Garfield (RENP)
Green (RENP, Title I)
*Hendley (RENP, Title I)
Leckie (RENP)
Malcolm X (RENP, Title I)
*McGogney (RENP, Title I)
Moten (RENP, Title I)
Patterson (RENP)
Savoy (RENP, Title I)
Simon (RENP, Title I)
Turner (RENP, Title I)
Washington Highland

Region II

Amidon (Title I) (Tri-School)
Bowen (Title I) (Tri-School)
Hardy (6 small schools)
Hyde (6 small schools)
Key (6 small schools)
*Lafayette
Mann (6 small schools)
*Stoddert (6 small schools)
Syphax (Title I) (Tri-school)

Region III

*Blow
*Davis
*Miner (Title I)
Thomas (Title I)

Region IV

Benning
Goding (Title I)
J. O. Wilson (Title I)
*Walker-Jones (Title I)
Weatherless (Title I)

Region V

*Bancroft
*Bruce-Monroe (Title I)
*Bunker Hill
*Cleveland (Title I)
*Meyer (Title I)
*Petworth

Region VI

*Noyes
Shaed
Whittier

Five area orientation meetings were held in November 1974 for the principals of the forty-four schools. At these meetings ideas and suggestions for reimplementing the Evaluation System were given by the principals. Additional meetings were scheduled throughout the months of December 1974 through February 1975 at each of the forty-four schools to explain the Evaluation System to the school staff prior to collecting data in the schools.

A meeting was held with the president of the Washington Teachers' Union to apprise him of the status of the Evaluation System and to obtain his approval of continued teacher participation in the Evaluation System.

Data collection was begun in the schools in December 1974 by four Division of Research and Evaluation teams of two people each. Collection time averaged four to five days per school. Data relating to students, teachers, and aides were collected for each class in the school. A listing was made of the special programs and projects in the school. In May 1975 a reading program form was completed by each teacher in the school for each student in his or her class. A second visit was made to each school by the data collectors in the spring to update student, teacher, and aide data.

During the summer of 1975 the Division of Research and Evaluation, in cooperation with the Division of Automated Information Services and outside consultants and facilities, processed the data from the reading forms completed by teachers during the month of May 1975.

Teachers in each of the forty-four Evaluation System schools were provided with initial feedback during the first week of September 1975. The initial feedback consisted of an individual reading profile for each child for whom a reading program form had been completed. Profiles for approximately 22,000 students were provided. These profiles helped teachers, especially those new to a school and/or the school system, to plan their instructional program for individual students by providing the following information:

1. The student's name, I.D. number, and past grade level
2. The primary reading material used with the student, the level of the material, and the second and the third most used materials with reading levels
3. The reason(s) why the particular materials were being used
4. Ratings by the previous teacher to:
    a. How similar the materials listed in May were to that used all year with the student

b. The student's interest in reading

c. How often the student reads on his own

d. The student's need of extra help in reading

5. The sources from which extra help in reading was received and the number of days of extra help.

Also during the summer and the months following, including the month of February 1976, the following tasks and steps were undertaken:

- Meetings were held by the Assistant Superintendent for Research and Evaluation and staff members with consultants, the Division of Automated Information Services, other central office personnel, and with the Acting Superintendent of Schools.
- Efforts were made to obtain resources and staff to process and analyze the numerous data collected during school year 1974-1975.
- Emphasis was given to reviewing and modifying data collection instruments for the purpose of designing machine-readable forms for school year 1975-1976.
- Procedures and timelines for meetings, processing of data, analysis of data, feedback, and collection of new data were established.

As a result of the great effort put forth by the staff of the Division of Research and Evaluation, consultants, the Division of Automated Information Services and central office personnel, furt analysis of the 1974-75 data was made and feedback was disseminated. Additionally, carefully designed machine-readable data collection instruments for 1975-76 were developed.

The second feedback prepared from the reading program form for each of the forty-four principals and each of the approximately 900 teachers enabled the principals and teachers to compare their school by grade level to all schools in the Evaluation System on the following aspects:

1. Students' interest in reading
2. How often students read on their own
3. Needs for extra help in reading
4. Number of days per week extra help is provided
5. Sources of extra help
6. Reasons for no extra help
7. Reasons for using particular materials.

Meetings were scheduled during the months of April and May 1976 to present and explain the feedback data to the Superintendent of Schools, the Vice Superintendent, and to each of the Regional Superintendents. The Regional Superintendents were given data representing the schools in their region only. Graphs were constructed from the second feedback to enable the Regional Superintendents to readily compare the schools in their region.

The third feedback pertained to teacher items on the classroom student background data form. The data presented in percentage tables reflected teacher absence and turnover rates by grade level for each school and for all schools in the Evaluation System. Percentile distributions were also provided.

The fourth feedback pertained to student items on the classroom student background data form. Student absence and turnover rates were presented for each grade level by classroom, by school and by System. Percentile distributions were included. A month-by-month breakdown of the total number and percentages of new students and their type of entry for each grade was given for each school and for the forty-four schools in the System. A similar distribution was presented for discharges and types of discharges of students.

The fifth feedback pertained to classroom items on the classroom student background data form. This data was prepared for each grade level by classroom, by school, by all classes in the System and by all schools in the System. The data included the following elements of information:

1. The number of students for whom English is a second language (ESL)
2. The number of students eligible for free lunch
3. The number of students eligible for reduced cost lunch
4. The total membership.

5. The number of students referred for:

   a. Reading help

   b. Mathematics help

   c. Other educational help

   d. Behavior reasons

   e. Physical reasons.

The 1974-75 test data tapes received from California Test Bureau/ McGraw Hill were in an unusable format. As a result it was not possible to tie together all the data that represented selected variables of the educational programs into an evaluation report to be disseminated to the various audiences.

PART V

V The Evaluation System-School Year 1975-76 to the Present

During the summer and fall of 1976 the Division of Research and Evaluation, with the help of the Division of Automated Information Services, consultants and an outside agency, designed and developed new machine-readable data collection forms. These forms replaced existing data gathering instruments, eliminated the need for excessive writing on the part of teachers and Division staff, eliminated the need for keypunching, and provided for a move efficient use of time and resources.

The classroom student background data scan form was reproduced in February 1976. The form consists of two parts, a header sheet for collection of teacher and classroom data and a second sheet for the collection of individual student data. The reading program data scan form was reproduced in April 1976 and also consists of two parts, a header used for teacher and classroom reading program data and a second sheet for individual student reading program data.

Resources within the Division for evaluating RENP(Response to Educational Needs Project) schools located in Region I were lost for FY 76. As a result ten of the RENP schools added for 1974-75 were dropped from the Evaluation System. The schools dropped were:

Birney	Leckie	Simon
Draper	Moten	Turner
Garfield	Patterson	Washington Highland
Green		

During the school years 1975-76, 1976-77, and 1977-78 the Division of Research and Evaluation, the Division of Automated Information Services, other central office personnel, and consultants worked out approaches and procedures including all facets of the Evaluation System to be carried out during each of the three school years. Schedules were developed and responsibilities were assigned.

A procedure for preslugging, collecting, editing, scanning, and taping the data has been developed. Forms are preslugged using existing background information in the data bank. Division staff collect data in the 34 Evaluation System schools in January-February and again in May-June of each year using the machine-readable background form. Teachers in the 34 schools supply current reading program data by completing the machine-readable reading forms in May of each year. The data is edited, machine-scanned, and put on tape and disc files.

A procedure for acquiring raw Prescriptive Reading and Prescriptive Mathematics Test data tapes and for reformating the tapes into a usable form has been developed. This procedure provides for matching pre-post scores of all students taking the same level test within grade or across grades and thus, allows for gains to be computed.

A procedure for compiling, and analysing data has been developed. A number of computer programs have been developed to:

- Store, access and merge school, classroom, teacher and student data from the background file, the reading file and the test data file.

- Provide information needed for frequencies, means and other statistics used to describe the nature of classes and students.
- Permit statistical analyses of the data, i.e., regression analysis and analysis of covariance.

As a result of the procedures developed matched pre-post reading test data was provided for the first time in April 1977. An analysis of the data by the Division uncovered specific test item weaknesses in the Prescriptive Reading Tests and the Prescriptive Mathematics Tests.

Background data (student absence, sex, turnover rate, type of class, size of class and many other such measures) were merged with reading program data (most frequently used reading materials, level of materials, need for extra help in reading, sources and amount of extra help in reading, etc.) and test data (pretest results, posttest results, test level administered, etc.) into one file with the student as a base (Type S File) for the first time in September 1977 and with the class as a base (Type C File) for the first time in February 1978.

By September 1978 the Division was able to disseminate the first Evaluation System report generated from the procedures outlined. The report "Evaluation of Outcomes, 1975-76: An Evaluation System Report on Reading Programs and Reading Achievement" was issued in two parts: Part I - A Summary and Part II - A Technical Report. This first report has provided base data for subsequent reports.

Data are presently being analysed for a second report, "Evaluation of Outcomes, 1976-77" with dissemination planned for January 1979.

Data for "Evaluation of Outcomes, 1977-78" are presently being merged into one file. Dissemination of this, the third report, in the series is planned for June 1979.

The follow-up comparisons and analyses of the three years of the data described above are expected to provide significant findings for the school system for modification and/or development of educational programs and operations.

Prepared by
Division of Research and Evaluation

December 1978